



**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
ANDERSON/GREENWOOD DIVISION**

DALLAS DUNMORE,	§	
Plaintiff,	§	
	§	
vs.	§	Civil Action No. 8:24-6411-MGL
	§	
FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS, UNITED	§	
STATES OF AMERICA, TIAWO	§	
OLUSEGUN, V. COVAR, RICHARD VELEZ,	§	
K. HUGGINS, and TIMOTHY YOUNG,	§	
Defendants.	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND SUMMARILY DISMISSING WITH PREJUDICE
DEFENDANT FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS**

Plaintiff Dallas Dunmore (Dunmore), a federal prisoner who is representing himself, filed this civil action against Defendants Federal Bureau of Prisons (the BOP), United States of America, Tiawo Olusegun, V. Covar, Richard Velez, K. Huggins, and Timothy Young. He alleges violations of his constitutional rights under *Bivens v. Six Unknown Agents of Federal Bureau of Narcotics*, 403 U.S. 388 (1971), as well as violations of the Federal Tort Claims Act, 28 U.S.C. § 2671 et seq.

This matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge recommending the Court summarily dismiss the BOP from this action. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on December 18, 2024. To date, Dunmore has failed to file any objections.

“[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845–46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case under the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court the BOP is summarily **DISMISSED WITH PREJUDICE**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 16th day of January 2025, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Dunmore is hereby notified of his right to appeal this Order within sixty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.